

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the pending application is respectfully requested on the basis of the following particulars:

Objections to the specification

The Examiner's has objected to the specification because of informalities. In particular, the Examiner notes that "in the Brief Description of the [Drawings] on page 2, figures 3, 4, and 5 are described as first embodiments, and figure 6 is described as a third embodiment. Fourth and fifth embodiments are described on the next page." The Examiner poses the question "where is the second embodiment?"

In response, the Examiner is respectfully invited to review the Brief Description of the Drawings on page 2, wherein Figure 2 is described as "a perspective view of a second preferred embodiment of the present invention." Additionally, in the Detailed Description of the Invention, the second embodiment is again identified, with reference to Figure 2, in the last sentence on page 3 and continuing onto page 4 of the specification.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Rejection of claims 1, 2, and 5-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1, 2, and 5-7 presently stand rejected as unpatentable over Brummer (U.S. 3,893,501) in view of Maresh (U.S. 5,236,025). However, the Examiner has indicated that claim 4 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter is noted with appreciation. In this regard, Applicant has amended claim 1 to include the allowable subject matter of claim 4, and has cancelled claim 4 accordingly. The amended claim 1 now corresponds to claim 4 rewritten in independent form including all limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, as indicated by the Examiner to be allowable.

It is respectfully submitted that the amended claim 1 is now allowable, as indicated by the Examiner. Further, it is respectfully submitted that dependent claims 2, 6 and 7 which depend from the allowable claim 1, are also allowable. Claim 5 has been cancelled.

Non-elected species

Applicant has cancelled claims 3 and 8-14, directed to the non-elected species of the invention.

Remaining art of record not relied upon to reject any claims

The amended claims have been compared with the remaining art cited by the Examiner and it is respectfully submitted that the claims are patentable over such prior art.

Conclusion

In view of the amendments to the claims, and in further view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is requested that claims 1, 2, 6 and 7 be allowed and the application be passed to issue.

If any issues remain that may be resolved by a telephone or facsimile communication with the Applicant's attorney, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the numbers shown.

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC
625 Slaters Lane, Fourth Floor
Alexandria, Virginia 22314-1176
Phone: (703) 683-0500

Date: August 8, 2005

Respectfully submitted,



RICHARD E. FICHTER
Attorney For Applicant
Registration No. 26,382